R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 350 UD 005 306

AN INFORMATIVE REPORT TO THE LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION.

BY- TRIGG, GORDON P. AND OTHERS
OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

PUB DATE 15 JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.84 19P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, *INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, *HUMAN RELATIONS UNITS, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, SECONDARY EDUCATION, ADULT EDUCATION, YOUTH PROGRAMS, CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, ESEA, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

INCLUDED IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE PROGRESS REPORTS FROM THE OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS ON (1) PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER TITLES II-A AND I-B OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT (ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND ADULT EDUCATION, AND YOUTH SERVICES), (2) ACTIVITIES OF THE HUMAN RELATIONS UNIT, (3) INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, (4) COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAMS, AND (5) CITIZENS' COMPENSATORY EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES. (AF)

05306

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED019350

AN INFORMATIVE REPORT
to the
LOS ANGELES CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

UD 005 306

OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Thursday, June 15, 1967
2 P.M.

Presentation by:
Gordon P. Trigg
Coordinator, Youth Opportunities
Office of Urban Affairs

Mr. President, Members of the Board, Mr. Superintendent:

For the purpose of this report, I wish to review my major responsibilities in the Office of Urban Affairs -- that of Joint Powers Representative to the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency of Greater Los Angeles, and that of Coordinator of Economic Opportunity Act programs as they relate to the Los Angeles City Schools.

The Superintendent and Board should be commended for their foresightedness in providing the opportunity for this School District to participate in the Joint Powers Agreement. Staff of this School District should also share in this recognition in that they developed the details which made it possible for us to participate. As you know, the Joint Powers Agreement first involved the District in a cooperative effort with the Youth Opportunities Board, and presently with the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency. The major objectives of these two agencies; the Youth Opportunities Board "Inter-Agency approach to better deliverance of service, and the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency stressing the maximum feasible participation of the poor," to me, closely parallels the purposes and objectives of the Office of Urban Affairs. Our involvement with these two agencies presented new avenues for the District to become involved in compensatory education. They were the vehicle that provided the financial resources for edudators to explore new and innovative ways to better serve the school-community, and at the same time an opportunity for educators to test ideas, concepts, and new programs.

Working with these agencies introduced school personnel to a closer relationship with other professions. Of these, the sociologists provided educators the opportunity to view the problems of education from the aspect of their discipline. Further, it provided school personnel with the opportunity to hear and discuss aspects of education with community groups and agencies, who for the most part introduced challenging problems. While involvement of community groups and parents was not new to school personnel, the concept of involving citizens in the planning and preparation of programs necessitated the need to re-assess traditional methods of operation. The challenge here was to reach out and attempt to motivate a segment of our population who had not previously been actively involved. In spite of many difficult and complex problems associated with federal aid to education, in spite of anxieties and disappointments with each new program; we continued to participate, to react, to learn, and to attempt to serve our school population within the guidelines of federal legislation.

Perhaps, at this time, it would be well to review our accomplishments over the past two and one-half years under the Economic Opportunity Act. The programs to be outlined were funded under Title II-A and Title I-B of the Act. These programs do not include the total activities of the District under the Economic Opportunity Act, but highlight the activities of the Office of Urban Affairs and my immediate responsibilities.

ELEMENTARY DIVISION PROGRAMS

We should note that our first true involvement came under the Juvenile Delinquency and Crime Prevention Act of 1963 and afforded the District the first opportunity to participate in pre-school education of children. It is with pride that we note this fact, for our efforts precede the federal government in this critical area by one year.

In reviewing the seven elementary division programs, it should be noted that the Pre-School Program and the Summer Study Center Program has been continued under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and that the concept of the Reception Room is reflected in other Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs.

We have attempted to also indicate the number of schools that were involved in each program and the amount of monies, totaling nearly five million dollars which were granted.

SECONDARY DIVISION PROGRAMS

It is with pride again that we note the programs having their source of implementation under the Economic Opportunity Act have been continued under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have included the Neighborhood Youth Corps as one of the programs under the Secondary Division. The amount of money totaling over eight and one-half million dollars is a composite of Title II-A and Title I-B.

ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A third area of involvement in educational programs includes the Adult Education Branch of our School District. Within these programs we served the youngest children, namely the pre-school, and some of the oldest citizens within our school community. The total grants for Adult Education exceeded one and three-quarter million dollars.

YOUTH SERVICES SECTION PROGRAM

Our most limited involvement relates to some of the summer recreational programs involving the Youth Services Section. These programs provided the District with the opportunity of extending their on-going programs in an attempt to reach young people who had not been involved in purposeful activities during the summer months. Total grants of more than a quarter of a million dollars assisted the District in providing activities.

From a monetary standpoint, our efforts total $15,774,213 in federal grants.

In review of these programs, one can see that the involvement in the Economic Opportunity Act provided the District with a head start in developing programs which had as their goal better educational services to people. The programs outlined provided principals and staffs an opportunity to explore each individual school's educational program and strengthen it as they saw their individual educational needs. Such programs served the needs of citizens from remedial to enrichment, from cultural to recreational, from the very young to the aged. Some programs strengthened the school day while other programs

involved students before or after the school day ended, on Saturdays, and during summer months. The Neighborhood Youth Corps program included the concept of reimbursement of monies to young people for performing realistic work experiences. Although many of our programs have met with success as demonstrated by the District's continuation under ESEA, all our efforts have not met with rewards or success. We still have much to learn in the ability to reach the hard core disadvantaged, to motivate them; and, increase the holding power of the school.

Besides the educational aspects of these programs I should like to explore some of the more promising practices which we have experienced within the Joint Powers Agreement. The employment of citizens of the school-community as Education Aides in the Elementary Pre-School and Adult Pre-School programs has provided educators with the experience and realization that community people can make a real and meaningful contribution to the educational program. The employment of citizens to work as School-Community Aides, in an attempt to build understandings and bridge the communication gap between the school and the immediate community, demonstrated to educators their value in enlisting the local citizens in support of their schools. Many of the programs provided school personnel with the time to meet parents, not only in the school, but in their homes, and further provided the opportunity to participate in community group activities. It is this type of involvement that helps bridge the gap of misunderstanding, which oftentimes leads to mistrust and withdrawal of support of schools and their programs.

In closing, perhaps we should explore what the future holds for our District under the Economic Opportunity Act. With recent cutbacks of appropriations by the Federal government, the earmarking of funds by Congress, and the placing of educational programs on the lowest priority level by the Office of Economic Opportunity, there appears little hope that our District will continue to enjoy the privilege of serving our citizens as we have in the past two and one-half years. It is rewarding to note that the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency Board, in light of the placing of educational programs on the lowest priority by the Office of Economic Opportunity, recently adopted an educational rationale which supports the need for schools to be continuously involved in Economic Opportunity Act programs. This rationale recognizes that Community Action Agencies, through the schools, have an opportunity to bring about community change. It recognizes that schools represent an agency that at some time reaches all of the population of the community, that the schools represent a source of knowledge and expertise in the development, planning, implementation, and operation of educational programs, that remedial and basic education programs constitute a major portion of the development of manpower resources in the training and retraining of citizens. It is our hope that we will be provided the opportunity of continuous participation under the Joint Powers Agreement, and that under this Agreement, we will continue to serve all of the citizens in our school community.

HUMAN RELATIONS

Presentation by:
William H. Bailey
Director, Human Relations Unit
Office of Urban Affairs

Mr. President, Members of the Board, Mr. Superintendent:

In an effort to provide a direct, unencumbered avenue for the submission of grievances and problems, the Human Relations Unit has found that one of its principal activities is to accommodate the unique needs of this large, ethnically diversified school community. It is necessary to carry an ear to the allegedly aggrieved person or group, and by doing so to immediately let them know we care. As a corollary to this, it may be seen that we must be available at any time it is convenient to the aggrieved.

Briefly, let us review the posture of this unit by considering this major activity.

(Chart I)

I. Where do problems and cases come from?
II. What kind of problems do we receive?
III. What have been the results of our efforts?

The greater portion of the communications to the Human Relations Unit in 1966 involved problems and cases. These calls for help emanate from certificated, classified and lay people, with an even split between the percentage of certificated and classified.

In the main, these complaints constitute the major source of our grievance workload, but quite often individuals and groups will invite us to meetings to help them with a discussion of some educational problem. Out of these rather general discussions may come a better understanding on both sides, or the basis for a complaint.

Failure to succeed in gaining employment or promotional frustration constitute the largest number of cases coming from certificated and classified personnel (aggrieved community groups usually express unhappiness with the disciplinary treatment of a student, or an alleged inequity in the quality of education being offered at one school, as compared to another). In both cases, the complaints usually have racial, religious, or cultural overtones.

On certain occasions, cases have been referred to us from Personnel and other Divisions when ethnicity has been a factor in a dispute.

What kind of problems do we receive?

While I have touched briefly on this subject, it might be informative to add some detail.

A number of problems involving evaluation procedures find their way to our office. While the aggrieved may sign an evaluation form, they frequently have strong feelings about an alleged prejudicial attitude of the referent.

HUMAN RELATIONS .....

The next most frequently received problem is in the area of the oral portion of our examinations. Cases reach us because the impression has been gained that the examinee was not successful due to race, age, or regional speech patterns.

Problems in those two areas are most subjective and therefore extremely difficult to resolve. It may be necessary to review the weight given to oral examinations with a view to considering the subjectivity of this part of the examination.

Aware of the Boards' concern in this area, two members of the Office of Urban Affairs are serving on the committee with those from the Personnel Division who are studying the problem; the Office has presented to that group, certain suggestions for revisions.

What have been the resusts of our efforts?

The Personnel (and other Divisions), with the help of Board Committees, have met with us to review and improve personnel procedures. The superintendents all over the city have opened their doors to our meetings and opened their minds to our innovations. Thus, as we implement the many new programs already mentioned, it is clear that we are developing a "human relations" posture second to none.

Administrators and teachers are showing a greater interest in sensitivity and human relations in-service training classes. Still, it is interesting to note that in this period of time we mandate for State credentialing, a course in audio-visual education, but still leave our "neophyte" teachers rather naked in terms of their being exposed to a sufficient number of experiences in inter-group and human relations.

Since there is little material available for use in such educational programs, it became necessary to create a comprehensive program of human relations offerings for several different groups - programs which consider the uniqueness of each groups' needs. Our initial planning sessions brought us to the realization that this program had to include workshops for administrators, teachers, parents, and students; this we are doing. The subject areas range all the way from, "Inflammatory Words and Phrases", to understanding the "Disadvantaged Student".

As we continually re-set our sights and make new adjustments in our program, we have become encouraged enough to believe that eventually we will have created a two-way bridge between administrators, faculties, students, and parents.

Let's take a look at the typical birth of a workshop:

First, the School-Community Relations Consultant, with the principal, explore the human relations climate of the school. If a workshop appears to be the desired instrument of change, the principal convenes a steering committee of teachers to discuss the concerns and problems that they feel need workshop attention.

At this point, the Human Relations Unit assigns a trained workshop leader to join the team, and help them to build a customized workshop tailored to meet the specific needs of that school and its community. At no time is a workshop imposed by "outsiders" who think they know what people want and need.

In addition to the variety of subjects and areas studied and readied for use, the Office of Urban Affairs has collected and catalogued numbers of position papers, pamphlets, articles and bibliographies from all parts of the country. These materials are reproduced and supplied to workshop participants, as requested.

During the first year of our operation we offered one workshop each semester, and one during the summer. Currently, we are offering ten workshops each semester, and two symposia during the summer.

With an expansion of staff and additional resources, we hope to make our services available to every segment of our vast system.

In addition to the service offered in the areas of grievance resolution and in-service training, the Office of Urban Affairs has initiated, co-sponsored, or provided assistance for the following:

Student Human Relations Workshops

Currently in operation in 17 senior high schools and 12 junior high schools. This program was described by Mr. Hancock.

Guidelines for Human Relations Representatives in Schools

Here can be another force in improving human relations. It involves the training of an administrator and a faculty member at a school to be the specialist who will work with the faculty in developing techniques and resource materials concerned with human relations.

Student Conferences

Student Conferences are designed as part of a plan begun in May, 1965, at Los Angeles High School, which encourages an exchange of ideas, techniques, and intergroup understandings among students from all parts of the city.

The following activities were also presented by our unit:

(a) Camp Seminars
(b) U.C.L.A. Summer Opportunities Program
(c) Phalanx Club Scholarship
(d) Contributions of Minority groups
(e) The Policeman Bill Project
(f) Operation "Cool-it"

Working with the Los Angeles City Schools Human Relations Council, our unit collaborated in the production of the following publications:

(a) Improving Inter-Group Relations - November, 1963
(b) The Teacher and Inter-Group Relations, 1964
(c) Improving Inter-Group Relations, Publication No. 4, 1965
(d) Outline for Student Human Relations Committees

These, then, are some of the areas in which the Human Relations Unit has labored in its efforts to reduce the impact of urbanization upon our pupils, our teachers and administrators, and in our communities.

STUDENT HUMAN RELATIONS WORKSHOPS

Presentation By
Phil Zwerdling
Consultant
Office of Urban Affairs
Human Relations Unit

Mr. President, Members of the Board, Mr. Superintendent:

Student Human Relations Workshops is an experimental program for junior and senior high schools of the Los Angeles City Schools. The program has been developed by the Advisory Council on Human Relations and the Office of Urban Affairs of the Los Angeles City Schools.

The program began in December, 1966, and now has 17 senior and 17 junior high schools as participants. Plans are being formulated to expand the program to sixty-five secondary schools, and a number of adult education high schools in the fall of 1967.

Objectives

To improve human relations in the schools, with the parents, the community and the community agencies. The Los Angeles City Schools recognizes that good communities do not just happen, but are the result of the cooperative efforts of the school and citizens within the community.

Our educational task is particularly challenging because of the many diverse cultural, ethnic, religious, and socio-economic groups in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. The vast population increases and the mobility of the population within the school district present problems which merit consideration by local school administrators and teachers who need to be alerted to the impact of the community on the school and its educational services.[1]

SHRW Program*

There are three phases to the SHRW program. Phase I involves the training of faculty sponsors, phase II the formation of student workshops on each campus, and phase III the weekly program for each SHRW.

Phase I - Teachers who were selected to sponsor the SHRW program participated in 15 hours of training in human relations and group dynamics. These training sessions took place on Saturdays and were funded from state and federal sources. The training was divided into five 3-hour sessions. Each session was led by group dynamics specialists from the local university. Separate training sessions were scheduled for the junior and senior high faculty sponsors so that the dynamics of small groups discussions could readily occur.

Initial phases of the faculty training were devoted to a free exchange of viewpoints on purposes, educational objectives, personal commitments to the intergroup relations objectives of the program.

The last six hours of the training program were devoted to methods of implementing the campus phase of the program and the problems encountered in starting the program.

[1] Office of Urban Affairs, Outline for Student Human Relations Committees. Los Angeles: Los Angeles City Schools, 1966 p. 1

* SHRW are the initials of Student Human Relations Workshops

Summary of Phase I.

The following were matters of greatest concern and discussion during these sessions:

1. Administrative support by the principal and the school district. Throughout the entire 15 hours of Phase I, spread out in meetings over a period of four months, various participants (teachers) continually discussed the role of administration in the program.

   These concerns were met primarily by having the Area Superintendent and the Coordinators of the program speak to a special meeting of the principals whose schools were part of the program. As the program is structured to allow each principal final say as to when the campus phase of the program begins, individual contacts were also made with principals to clarify concerns and to customize the program to the needs of the school and its community.

Much favorable publicity was given to the schools that first started the campus phase of the program, and this appears to be the main factor in spreading the program.

2. The second major concern was the amount of freedom the SHRW[2] program would have to discuss controversial subjects. The program is designed to discuss "hot items", e. g., minority and majority group responsibilities, inter-racial dating, dress, and cosmetics standards.

This concern was met by meeting with students at each campus to explain that the prupose of the program was not only to discuss important issues but to devise methods of solving them. This then required administrative and faculty support if the changes were to be initiated.

3. The third major area of concern was that of securing membership that is representative of the entire student body. Concern was expressed that the SHRW would be another "good kids" organization.

This concern was met by specifying in the Outline for Student Human Relations Committees that membership should be from "the wide range of ethnic, socio-economic, national, religious and political diversity that is representative of the student body".[3]

Wherever initial membership of the SHRW did not meet, the broad-base criteria the additional step of personal contacts by the faculty sponsors or student members was used.

Phase II - SHRW was introduced to the faculty and students of pilot schools in a variety of ways. Some of the schools used assembly-type programs featuring prominent speakers, films and dramatic skits.

At some schools an open invitation was posted briefly explaining the objectives of the program and inviting students to attend an orientation meeting.

---

[2]Ibid., p. 8

[3]Ibid., p. 5

STUDENT HUMAN RELATIONS WORKSHOPS.....

Some faculty sponsors just explained the program at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. The faculty was asked to nominate students for the SHRW program. Each nominee was then interviewed by the sponsor. Selection of students was based on the criteria of representation of the wide cultural, ethnic, religious, socio-economic and political diversity that was found on campus.

Phase III - SHRW have been meeting regularly at each campus. Students through discussions have chosen topics, devised projects, invited resource persons, and publicized their activities to the student body and the local community.

SHRW Discussions have included:

(a) Extra curricular club, membership and structure.
(b) Contributions of minority groups to the American Society.
(c) Stimulating intergroup interaction and avoidance of segregation.
(d) Cosmetics and conformity.
(e) Intercultural, interfaith and inter-racial dating.
(f) The potential dropouts.
(g) Civil Rights for teenagers.
(h) Minority and majority group responsibilities.
(i) Housing and Human Relations.
(j) Parental aspirations and student success.
(k) Rumor, stereotypes and racial myths.
(l) Language differences
(m) Violence vs. non-violence
(n) Segregation in lunch areas.

Projects have included the following:

(a) Human Relations column in the school paper.
(b) Orientation of new students.
(c) Inter-school meetings of SHRW students.
(d) Glossary of student jargon.
(e) Current events displays.
(f) Community tours of local business and commercial establishments.
(g) Civics days.
(h) Displays of cultural backgrounds.
(i) Career opportunity day.
(j) Community survey of existing and needed public and private agencies.
(k) Brotherhood Week displays and programs.
(l) Police Department facilities tour.
(m) Conferences with the Community Relations Unit of the Police Department.

Student Evaluations (June 1, 1967)
Basis of report: Analysis of 274 student evaluation forms.
Average attendance: 18.2 students.
74% of students rated meetings as good or excellent.
91% of students stated the meetings contributed some or considerably to their understanding of human relations.

Students expressed an almost unanimous approval of the informality of free discussion although there were a few negative comments on excessive noise due to students talking out of turn.

STUDENT HUMAN RELATIONS WORKSHOPS.....

The most successful meetings presented an introduction of the subject with specific points in the form of a film, speaker, or questionnaire. Apparently these were effective techniques in several respects as follows:

1. Stimulated interest
2. Provided common orientation
3. Focused attention
4. Encouraged maximum exploration in time limit
5. Aroused desire for more knowledge of subject

The most frequent suggestion offered pertained to pursuing the problems in depth, holding more meetings, and having longer meetings. This usually involved the difficulty of finding time to permit maximum participation.

Some of the most successful meetings were held on the following topics:

Mexican-American Relations
The Problems of the Negro
School-Student Relations
The Watts Riots
Drop-outs
Capital Punishment

STUDENT HUMAN RELATIONS WORKSHOPS.....

Student Human Relations Workshops in operation as of June 15, 1967:

Junior High Schools

1. Adams Jr. High
2. Audubon Jr. High
3. Belvedere Jr. High
4. Burroughs Jr. High
5. Carver Jr. High
6. Drew Jr. High
7. Edison Jr. High
8. Foshay Jr. High
9. Gompers Jr. High
10. Griffith Jr. High
11. Hollenbeck Jr. High
12. Mann Jr. High
13. Markham Jr. High
14. Muir Jr. High
15. Nightingale Jr. High
16. Pasteur Jr. High
17. Stevenson Jr. High

Senior High Schools

1. Banning High School
2. Belmont High School
3. Dorsey High School
4. Fairfax High School
5. Gardena High School
6. Garfield High School
7. Hamilton High School
8. Jefferson High School
9. Jordan High School
10. Lincoln High School
11. Los Angeles High School
12. Manual Arts High School
13. San Fernando High School
14. San Pedro High School
15. Venice High School
16. Washington High School
17. Wilson High School

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Presentation by:
Mr. Ross Hancock
Consultant
Office of Urban Affairs

Mr. President, Members of the Board, Mr. Superintendent:

Thank you for the opportunity to present to you this progress report concerning the In-Service Training, ESEA funded programs.

In the Office of Urban Affairs, the position of Consultant, In-Service Training, ESEA Funded Programs, is concerned with two areas of responsibility which have been delegated to the Office of Urban Affairs.

One is the establishment of special training courses for teachers, counselors, and administrators that increase their understanding of disadvantaged people.

The other is working cooperatively with the Educational Divisions of the school system, agencies, institutions of higher learning, and community people to increase intergroup understandings through interaction.

To carry out these responsibilities, this position has the following objectives:

- To increase the school staff's understanding of the children and adults in the disadvantaged areas;

- To train teachers and administrators to lead faculty and student human relations workshops in their schools;

- To increase communication between community and school;

- To develop original materials which increase the school staff's knowledge of Negroes and Mexican-Americans and other minority groups.

The objectives have been reached through in-service workshops, college operated workshops, and pre-service workshops. To develop and implement these various workshops requires that this position work cooperatively with:

- The District's Educational Curriculum, and Personnel Divisions,

- Private industry, agencies, colleges and universities, community people and groups.

Funds with which to operate the various workshops have come from EYOA, McAteer, Civil Rights Act of 1964, ESEA-Title I, and the Los Angeles City School District.

Here are examples of workshops focused on increasing the understanding of children and adults in the disadvantaged areas.

(Slide 1 & 2)

IN-SERVICE TRAINING .....

This position's next major area of training is the Student and Faculty Human Relations Workshops. The objectives of this area are:

- Improving intergroup relations in individual schools
- Increasing understanding of social changes now taking place

I think it would be interesting for you to see the growth in this area from seventeen secondary school human relations workshops to fifty-six secondary school human relations workshops proposed for 1967-68.

(Slide 3 & 4)

To meet the objective of bringing about school and community acceptance of each other and to personalize this relationship, it was necessary for this position to work directly with local community people.

It was most satisfying to support people from the community of Watts as they planned a welcome for the new teachers assigned to Watts' schools. The combined efforts of community people, Neighborhood Adult Participation Project, San Fernando State College, and this position produced the project, "Teacher Orientation to Watts" or "Welcome New Teacher! We are pleased you chose to teach our children."

(Slide 5)

This projects effectiveness can be summed up in the remarks of one of the new teachers. "I realize that there is a community here which is as interested in the welfare of their children as I am. I also realize that the hostile child is not typical of this community's children."

A similar project was developed by East Los Angeles community people, Urban Affairs School-Community personnel, and this position.

(Slide 6)

Following the East Los Angeles workshop, a new teacher wrote, "I had not been aware that in East Los Angeles there is this great attempt at cohesiveness between school and community for the benefit of children. It was a wonderful welcome for anyone coming into the community, and it made me feel fortunate indeed that I accepted a position in the East area."

Before closing, I would like to tell you of one more project. A series of motion picture films on the Mexican-American student planned by Urban Affairs in cooperation with the District's Curriculum Division, California State College at Los Angeles, UCLA, and the Mexican-American community. These films will be telecast, and will be the heart of a special training course for certificated and classified personnel, if funded.

It is felt by all parties concerned that the films produced by this project will have import for teacher education in California and the Southwest section of the United States. Currently, there is little in the way of well documented visual material on the Mexican-American students. Funds for this project are being sought from the McAteer Bill.

Thank you for the opportunity to report on some of the Specially Funded projects involving the Office of Urban Affairs, In-Service Training position.

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Presentation by:
Mr. Arnold Rodriguez
Director of Community Relations
Office of Urban Affairs

Mr. President, Members of the Board, Mr. Superintendent:

Our program has as its goal the establishment and maintenance of an effective, harmonious and continuous system of communications between the schools and the communities they serve. We function as the connecting link, the catalyst, if you will, that attempts to bring citizens and parents in target areas into an effective dialogue with the school administrators and school teachers. Further, the staff of the project provide means whereby our school administrators can effectively bridge a communication gap existing in many of our communities. This communication gap has lead, on occasions, to misunderstandings, resentment, and even hostility toward the schools, and has served to re-enforce certain stereotypes of minorities due to the schools lack of awareness. The question might be raised, "Why can't the schools themselves handle the problems? If the teachers and administrators do a good job, won't the results of these efforts be all that is needed to maintain harmonious relationships between school and community?"

Unfortunately, in a community as complex and diverse as Los Angeles, with its variety of population groups, the answer is, "No!" Too often in the past, we accepted as evidence of harmonious relations, the absence of complaints on the part of our parents and the community. We have found that where there is no dialogue between the agency of government and the people it was created to serve; there are resulting frustrations which often lead citizens to reject the agency's program. Programs developed without dialogue with the community, many times are rejected by the community because they feel left out.

At best, effective communication is a difficult business and requires a continuous commitment and a degree of receptiveness and understanding by both parties. We know that the diversity of the population we serve tends to create barriers to satisfactory communications, barriers caused by language differences, by cultural differences, and by social and economic differences. I should emphasize that such conditions are endemic not only to Los Angeles; these barriers to effective group interaction are found in all urban areas. Administrators and teachers often have failed to recognize the problem and have not seen the necessity for developing a mutually satisfactory dialogue with the community. Hence the necessity for the Office of Urban Affairs, Community Relations Program.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds, supplemented by local effort, have provided for a program where a team of school-community relations consultants have been assigned to certain geographic areas, but only to those which qualify under this Act. The Consultants have had, prior to this assignment, at least five years of teaching experience, speak Spanish (if necessary), and many were born and raised in the area they are now serving. While not assigned to specific schools, they utilize school facilities, and frequently tie themselves to the neighborhood by sharing facilities with other community agencies.

Leadership development is one of our roles. We help the community to develop its own human resources. This done, the community is better able to express its needs

and expectations to those of us in the schools. From my description then, you may see the essential element here is sensitivity. It should be emphasized that the consultant is never a leader, spokesman, or interpretor of the concerns of the community, nor is he an apologist for our schools. They are not, however, manipulators of community people, for to play this role would be to destroy their effectiveness in the community. Rather, he serves the community as a resource person, a helper, or a connector between the people and the schools. Often, for the first time, individuals in the community find that the consultant is a person who has the time to answer questions, provide information, give guidance, and help in ameliorating their problems. This obvious concern on the part of the schools, hopefully, leads to direct community participation.

Another function of the consultant is that of apprising the local administration of the attitudes and feelings he finds in the community. Often the report will consider only the mood of a neighborhood or an item of general concern. Such actions on the part of the consultant tend to produce a feeling of partnership between school and community, an understanding that the education of the young is a joint effort.

Our three teams, each composed of a coordinator and five consultants, serve the East Los Angeles and the Valley, the Central area, as well as the Southern and Harbor areas. Our resources are available to the non-public schools and to every school eligible to receive ESEA Title I services. On recommendation of a consultant, in cooperation with the principal and faculty, our Director of Human Relations will establish an In-Service Training Workshop in a school so that the faculty may learn more about a community and its people. Again, our consultants are possibly the best source available should one wish to study a community.

Finally, we are co-sponsoring a number of Youth Opportunity Conferences, in cooperation with such community organizations as the Latin-American Civic Association, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, and Career Opportunity and Youth. These conferences are aimed at the average young people in the community. They bring to the pupil not the nuclear scientist or baseball player, but rather the men and women who have found success in the everyday world of work and take pride in their achievements.

I should like to say in closing that your personnel who are working in the field of community relations certainly are walking that extra mile. Demands are made on their time which is over and beyond that expected during a normal work day. They are attending night meetings, weekend meetings, and spending long hours in their assignments. So that they will be available to the community at all times, they are being asked to sacrifice their supplemental income by giving up all night school assignments. Community relations, then, does relate to people--individually, in groups, in communities. It adds to the stature of the Los Angeles School System that they are sponsoring such programs in school-community relations.

Thank you.

CITIZENS' COMPENSATORY EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Presentation by:
Mrs. Paulene Hopkins
Specialist
Office of Urban Affairs

Mr. President, Members of the Board, Mr. Superintendent:

Thank you for the opportunity to present to you this progress report concerning the Citizens' Compensatory Education Advisory Committees.

The State Board of Education at its July 14-15, 1966, meeting adopted guidelines for development of the advisory compensatory education committees as developed by the Commission on Equal Opportunities in Education and the Advisory Compensatory Education Commission. Copies of these guidelines were received by the Los Angeles City Schools on July 22, 1966, from the Office of Compensatory Education of the State Department of Education. These guidelines require that a school district receiving funds under ESEA Title I establish local advisory committees to bring about the cooperation and coordination of community resources. An additional function would be to take advantage of available state and federal sources of funding in the development of comprehensive compensatory education plans.

Parents residing in the project area whose children are attending schools operating ESEA Title I programs must comprise at least 50 percent of the membership of each committee. Remaining advisory committee membership requires the inclusion of representatives from school district staff, non-public school agencies responsible for education of disadvantaged children in the project areas, public agencies of health and welfare, and leadership from the local community, civic, business, labor, ethnic, or religious groups.

In late August, Dr. Crowther assigned the responsibility for the organization and coordination of the school district advisory committees to the Office of Urban Affairs.

In making recommendations regarding the geographic areas to be served by the advisory committees, consideration was given to the number of students residing in the areas that qualify for compensatory education, the number of schools within these areas, the number of schools that were implementing compensatory education programs utilizing Title I funds, and the ethnic distribution of the total area. The staff of the Office of Urban Affairs, utilizing the services of the Legal Adviser and the Maps and Boundaries Section, recommended that an equitable area distribution could be adequately served by three committees, Committees A,B, and C.

The 102 members are divided into three 34-member committees including equal representation on each committee of parents whose children are participating in compensatory education programs in both the public and non-public schools, and an equal number of representatives from agencies and organizations. The three 34-member advisory committees serve the following areas:

Committee A - Serving East Los Angeles, San Fernando and Pacoima

Committee B - Serving Central Los Angeles, Venice and Ocean Park

Committee C - Serving South Los Angeles, San Pedro and Wilmington

CITIZENS' COMPENSATORY EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES .....

In order to have a complete cross section of opinions and desires expressed through the advisory committees, the Office of Urban Affairs took great care to solicit representation from as broad a spectrum of the community as possible. Each 34-member committee is composed of 17 parents and 17 agency persons.

Using the mandated classifications for representation on the advisory committees, 17 agency classifications were determined:

1 - local community action agency
1 - non-public school agency community person
3 - civic organizations
1 - public housing authority (This was in lieu of representation of settlement houses)
1 - business
1 - labor
1 - religious
2 - ethnic group organizations
1 - health
1 - welfare
3 - representatives from the school district (one representing elementary, one representing secondary, and one representing the Central Office)
1 - PTA - although the guidelines does not specify representation from the PTA, we felt that PTA should be represented.

The 17 parent representatives were assigned as follows:

9 at the elementary level
4 at the junior high level
4 at the senior high level

On December 28, 1966, the members of the three Citizens' Compensatory Education Advisory Committees were called together for an orientational meeting at the Tenth District PTA Health Center. They were, at that time, addressed by Dr. Seyler, Sam Hamerman, and Dave Schwartz. The presentations concerned themselves with the purpose and role of the advisory committees; the basis for selection of the individuals; the geographic areas being served by compensatory education programs under Title I; and overview of the Los Angeles City Schools; and the part that Title I plays in the compensatory education programs. A suggested set of by-laws, as developed by the School District's Legal Adviser, was presented to them as a guide in developing their own organizational structure.

Subsequent meetings have been held each month by the three individual committees with Committee A adopting the by-laws as suggested with the exception of one minor revision. Committee A has elected permanent officers. Mrs. Consuelo Raya, a parent, is the chairman, while Mr. Peter Perez, an agency representative, is vice-chairman.

Committee B is still operating under a temporary chairman, Rev. John Bain.

Committee C is operating under a temporary chairman, Rev. Samuel Anderson, and he has appointed a sub-committee to work on by-laws to be recommended to Committee C for adoption.

CITIZENS' COMPENSATORY EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEES .....

A series of informational meetings were held wherein the coordinators of individual Title I programs made detailed presentations to representatives from all three committees.

The availability of additional funds and the suggested utilization of these funds, taking amemdments and priorities I, II, and III, as adopted by the Board of Education, were reviewed in depth with individual advisory committees by the coordinators. All three committees gave unanimous endorsement to the amendments as recommended.

Meetings of the three committees, A and C, held in April and B on May 4, provided individual committee members an opportunity to spend time with coordinators of ESEA programs soliciting from committee members their advice and recommendations within the following categories:

a. Areas of cutback should funds be reduced
b. Areas for expansion should funds be increased
c. Revisions within individual program components should funds remain basically the same.

In order that committee members might have the opportunity to visit the on-going programs under ESEA, Title I, each member has been issued an identification card. Members interested in specific programs have visited those to gain a broader knowledge of the particular program.

Committee A met this morning and observed the pre-school program at Hammel Street School. Sub-committee members met with project coordinators and consultants to continue the dialogue of revision suggestions within individual program components. Committees C and B will meet on June 21 and June 29 respectively to continue the same.

July 5, 6, and 7 have been set aside for joint meetings of the committees for final reactions to proposed projects for the 1967-68 school year.

Thank you.